

FARMINGTON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Tuesday, November 21, 2006

PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR SESSION

Present: Chairman Jim Talbot, Commission Members John Bilton, Andrew Hiller, Kevin Poff, Cory Ritz, Paul Barker, Rick Wyss, City Planner David Petersen, and Recording Secretary Jill Hedberg.

Chairman Talbot called the meeting to order at 5:30 P.M. **Paul Barker** offered the invocation.

Motion

Kevin Poff moved that the Planning Commission consider Agenda Item #3 prior to Agenda Item #1. **Andrew Hiller** seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

PUBLIC HEARING: CENTERCAL PROPERTIES LLC - APPLICANT IS REQUESTING A RECOMMENDATION FOR PROJECT MASTER PLAN APPROVAL FOR THE PROPOSED STATION PARK MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT CONSISTING OF 97.89 ACRES AND LOCATED WEST OF I-15, EAST OF PARK LANE, AND NORTH OF CLARK LANE (M-9-06) (Agenda Item #3)

Background Information

The Planning Commission tabled this agenda item on November 8, 2006, in order to allow time for a number of issues to be resolved. This staff report provides the standards for PMPs as set forth in Section 11-18-107 of the Zoning Ordinance with the respective standard or requirement followed by comments from staff, where applicable, and/or a cross reference to information provided by the applicant.

11-18-107 Project Master Plan

(a) Project Master Plan (PMP) Required. A PMP is required for any development of property larger than five acres in size. All PMPs shall be submitted to the Planning Commission for approval. The Project Master Plan must show all phases of the development (including any phasing plans) in both existing and projected development. Approval of PMP does not constitute approval of individual site plans for any buildings or improvements within the PMP area. Any required PMP, including development plan approval, must be approved before any zoning permit is issued.

The development covers 97.89 acres and the applicant has provided comments regarding phasing in Section 4 (page 9) of the narrative. The Planning Commission provided their recommendation several months ago to rezone most of the property to TOD. The City Council has not yet acted on this recommendation.\

(b) Intent. The intent of the PMP is to establish a workable framework for the

development of large or phased projects. Major transportation, major drainage and grading, and water quality systems, major utilities, open space or land use issues within the PMP area shall be identified with a conceptual plan for addressing them. An approved PMP will guide all future development within the area defined by the PMP.

(c) *Application and Submittal. PMP applications shall be submitted to the City Planner.*

(d) *PMP requirements. PMP applications shall include the following information:*

(1) *Narrative submittal requirements. Unless waived by the City Planner, the following information shall be submitted in narrative form:*

a. Description of land use concepts, anticipated structures, ranges of square footage and general location, parking concept, public open space concept, and circulation concept of primary auto., bicycle and pedestrian and transit connections within the area and to adjoining properties.

The narrative should provide information about pedestrian connections to the Legacy Highway trail and allowing for future accommodation for a pedestrian connection to land north of the site. More should be added regarding pedestrian circulation, in general, throughout the site.

The applicant should provide more detail on how transit uses will connect with the Commuter Rail stop and how they plan to accommodate an access system to and from Lagoon.

b. Description of major transportation systems, including arterial streets, major storm water drainage and water quality systems, major utilities, open space or land use issues and discussion of how such issues will be addressed as development proceeds.

The applicant is proposed that the total Gross Leaseable Area (GLA) not exceed 1,700,000 square feet. Meanwhile, the applicant has not provided a full traffic assessment to the City, only initial transportation evaluation. Some members of City staff are recommending that the City limit the applicant's GLA to 1,300,000 and to further limit the percentage of housing until a more detailed report is provided.

Are the concepts discussed in the narrative acceptable to the City Engineer, Public Works Department, Fire Department, the City's Storm Water Official, Sewer District, and the secondary water provider?

c. Description of any contemplated development standards at the periphery of the PMP to promote compatibility between the PMP and adjoining properties.

d. Estimated sequence and estimated timing (where known) of project development, including on site infrastructure improvements, off-site infrastructure improvements, and supporting facilities.

See Section 4 (page 9) of the narrative.

e. Discussion of proposed incorporation of existing structures in future development plans.

The Site contains few existing structures, and most of these are dilapidated remnants of structures that will be torn down. The applicant provides good commentary on the existing shop site.

(2) PMP graphic submittal requirements. Unless waived by the City Planner, the following information shall be submitted in graphic form:

Most of the following are illustrated on the graphics submitted by the applicant. However, much of the following could be better highlighted on the plans with notes describing the same.

a. Diagram indicating the location of land uses by area, indicating the anticipated range of densities for each type of area within the PMP.

b. Diagram of circulation plans for primary vehicular, transit, bicycle, and pedestrian service.

The applicant should provide more detail on how transit uses will connect with the commuter Rail stop and to also accommodate an access system to and from Lagoon. Furthermore, more information should be provided regarding truck traffic through the site.

c. Concept plan showing the relationship of development to site ingress and egress and to public amenities.

d. Open space concept plan, showing both the general location and general configuration of the intended public and private open spaces, bicycle and pedestrian corridors.

e. Preliminary utility and regional storm water detention/retention plans.

f. Preliminary transportation analysis that addresses roadway network design, functional classification, lane requirements, and intersection control for arterial and collector roadways, modal split, trip distribution and bicycle, pedestrian, and transit facility plans that provide critical linkages to the surrounding local and regional transportation system.

The functional classification of streets should be highlighted on the plans, as well as land requirements and intersection control measures.

g. Proposed incorporation of existing structures in future development plans.

h. Maps and legal description of the boundaries of the project area.

The applicant must submit legal maps and legal Description for the area.

i. Proposed building configurations, elevations, anticipated massing, signage plan, and an overall schematic drawing of the proposed development.

(3) Waiver of specific submissions. Any information required by these PMP requirements may be waived by the Zoning Administrator on the basis that the information is not necessary to review the proposed PMP.

Pursuant to discussion during a study session with the Planning Commission on November 8, 2006, and unless required otherwise by the City Council, a waiver shall be granted for modal split requirements, building elevations and signage. But because the PMP does not constitute approval of individual site plans for any buildings or improvements within the PMP area, building elevations, signage, and modal split requirements (if any) will be reviewed and approved by the City as more specific plans are received. Nevertheless, the applicant must provide narrative that the building elevations will reflect a “small town” experience for the area.

The enclosed “Exhibit D-2” appears to be an exhibit designed for a development agreement and should not be included as part of the PMP.

(4) Planning Commission Public Hearing. The Planning Commission shall hold a public hearing on any proposed Master Plan within the TOD zone. The Planning Commission shall recommend approval or denial of the PMP.

(5) City Council Public Hearing. Upon receipt of a recommendation

from the Planning Commission, the City Council shall hold a public hearing on the proposed Master Plan. The City Council shall approve, with conditions, or deny the PMP.

(6) Except as provided below in Section 11-18-111 for PMPs approved in connection with the approval of a development agreement, the criteria for review of all PMPs by the Planning Commission and City Council shall be:

Thus far, it appears that the applicant's submittal complies with the following:

- a. Consistency with the Farmington City General Plan;*
- b. Compliance with City codes, rules, regulations and standards applicable to the proposed PMP.*
- c. Consistency with any Development Standards determined by the City to be applicable to all development within the TOD Zone; and*
- d. For development in the Core District, establishment of an appropriate mix of uses in locations that will promote and encourage the goals of the TOD zone.*

(7) Approval of a PMP shall constitute use approval for uses shown and described in an approved PMP and further conditional use approval shall not be required for applications which are consistent with an approved PMP.

(8) Recording. All approved PMPs, and all approved amendments to such PMPs shall be recorded in the real property records with a notation that all land within such boundaries shall be subject to the provisions of such PMP or amendment, unless or until amended.

(9) Major and minor amendments. An approved PMP may be amended at any time using the process set out herein, and may be amended simultaneously with the processing of a site plan application or a site plan amendment. The City Planner shall determine whether a proposed amendment is a "major" or a "minor" amendment. In order to initiate an amendment, the applicant shall submit to the City Planner those PMP submission items that would change if the proposed amendment were approved.

a. Major amendments. Major amendments shall be reviewed and approved by the Planning Commission. Changes of the following types, if included in the approved PMP, shall define an amendment as major:

i. To significantly modify or reallocate the allowable height, mix of uses, or density of a development; or

ii. To significantly alter the location or amount of land dedicated to parks, trails, open space, natural areas, or public facilities; or

iii. To significantly change the location of land use areas as shown on the original PMP.

b. Minor amendments. Amendments that are not major amendments shall be termed “minor amendments” and shall be referred to the zoning Administrator for review, who may also refer the application to other departments or agencies for comment. The Zoning Administrator shall approve, with conditions, or deny such amendment within twenty (20) calendar days after date of applicant’s submission of a complete application for amendment.

(10) Effect of recorded plans. All PMPs and PMP amendments shall be binding upon the applicants and their successors and assigns and approving agencies, and shall limit and control the issuance of all zoning permits and certificates and the construction, location, use and operation of all land and structures including within the PMP or PMP amendment.

(11) Appeals of decision. The final decision of the City to approve, approve with conditions or deny a PMP may be appealed as set forth in Utah Code Ann. 10-9a-801, or its successor section.

END OF PACKET MATERIAL.

David Petersen reviewed the “Background Information” and the “Possible Motions” which were included in the Commissioner’s packets. He explained that not all of the properties are zoned TOD, but the rezone process will begin in the near future. He said the overall square footage will not be determined until the traffic report is complete. The Development Review Committee has not offered their recommendations, but at this time, there do not appear to be any significant issues that need to be resolved. It is the recommendation of City staff and the City Attorney that the Planning Commission recommend Project Master Plan approval.

Public Hearing

Chairman Talbot opened the meeting to a public hearing and invited the applicant to address the Commission.

Elizabeth Angyl (CenterCal Representative) introduced the Center-Cal representatives and asked **Fred Brooney** to explain Center-Cal's vision of the project.

Fred Brooney said they are committed to creating a world class quality project in Farmington that will be the number one site in the community. They plan to create a project with a sense of place. He was concerned that the requirement to create a "small town" experience for the area may be limiting. Their goal is to provide architecture that is appealing to the City, as well as the tenants. They would like to propose that they work closely with the Planning Commission and community groups to develop a "sense of place," as well as a community gathering place. They are anticipating that the project will be approximately 1,300,000 square feet but will allow the traffic and parking study to determine what will work in the area.

Elizabeth Angyl reviewed the "Possible Motion" with the Planning Commission. She made the following comments regarding the proposed conditions:

- #1. Center-Cal accepts this condition.
- #2. Center-Cal accepts this condition. She explained where the trail connections will be located.
- #3. Center-Cal accepts this condition. The Lagoon shuttle will likely use the same route that is used by BRT.
- #4. Center-Cal hopes to have the first draft of the traffic study the first week in December. Center-Cal will review the traffic study when it is complete to determine whether they will adopt it. The southern most access point on Park Lane may be controversial since it may not meet UDOT's spacing requirements.
- #5. Center-Cal accepts this condition. CLC Engineering will contact the reviewing agencies to answer any questions they may have.
- #6. Center-Cal is accepting of the City's Planner's amendments to the PMP.
- #7. Center-Cal asked that this condition be deleted since it is an issue that should be addressed during Site Plan review.

- #8. Center-Cal accepts this condition.
- #9. Center-Cal submit their legal maps and legal description for the area.
- #10. Center-Cal is concerned that the term “small town” may limit the architecture of the project. She read text that was drafted by Center-Cal that they would prefer to use for this condition.
- #11. Center-Cal accepts this condition.

James Allstrom (Legal Counsel for Ron Martinez/America West Development) explained that **Ron Martinez** owns 135 acres of property north/west of the project and plans to create a project that will work with Station Park. They are paying attention to the requirements that relate to the goals for the area. He questioned whether the TOD district rezone will encompass the area north of Station Park.

David Petersen said the rezone will likely include the area that is bound by Clark Lane, Park Lane, and I-15.

As requested by **Commissioner Poff**, **Mr. Allstrom** pointed out where the America West property is located on the map. He explained that America West’s project will work in harmony with the City’s goals for the area.

Public Hearing Closed

With no further comments, **Chairman Talbot** closed the public hearing. The Commission members discussed the issues, including the following points:

In response to a question from **Kevin Poff**, **David Petersen** explained that UDOT controls Park Lane from I-15 to 1100 West.

Kevin Poff said he is concerned that the narrative does not reference the station building. He does not want the station to be a slab of concrete that turns into a “ghetto” for Farmington. He asked that the station be referenced in the narrative, as well as the need for a public gathering space. He also suggested that language be added to Section 2.1.2 of the narrative stating that “The City prefers traffic solutions which do not require traffic to stop on Clark Lane.” He said he is concerned that the proposed text will create the same type of traffic congestion that exists near retail centers in Layton.

In response to a question from **Kevin Poff**, **David Petersen** stated that Park Lane is not controlled by UDOT.

Kevin Poff questioned whether the City has considered traffic options that may require the roads to be reconfigured. He has not yet seen an acceptable traffic solution. There is only one chance for the City to do it right.

David Petersen said the City has not seriously considered relocating the roads. He said the City may be able to negotiate with UDOT to take over control of Park Lane.

Chairman Talbot indicated that the traffic study will only analyze the existing roads. It will not likely offer alternative solutions.

Elizabeth Angyl suggested that the following language be added to Section 2.1.2: *“Park Lane will be designed and signalized to facilitate safe traffic on Park Lane.”*

Kevin Poff said the proposed language will not prevent traffic from stopping on Park Lane. He believes there is a solution that has not yet been considered. He said he is concerned that the traffic issues have not been resolved.

Elizabeth Angyl said she will discuss the issue with their traffic engineers, and determine whether they are considering other alternatives.

David Petersen said if the Planning Commission approves the Project Master Plan, they will be able to consider the Site Plan at a later time, but they will no longer have control over the narrative.

Kevin Poff said he would like the project to include an actual station. If the transportation area is located outside of the central project, “it will become a haven of things that are not welcome in the City.”

Rick Wyss said the property is controlled by UTA so the City can not legally require that it be included in the Master Plan. He suggested that the City draft a Resolution recommending that UTA construct an actual station.

Kevin Poff said he does not expect Center-Cal to construct the station, but feels it should be included in the Master Plan for the area. He recommended that the developer and the City approach UDOT and request that an actual station be included in the project.

Rick Wyss expressed concern that the Commission may be overstepping their bounds by suggesting that the development should be moved to the train station.

Kevin Poff said from the earliest discussions regarding Station Park, it was the City and developer’s intent to include the station as a vibrant part of the development. It was never

intended for the station to be located in a back alley.

Fred Brooney stated that they do not own the station property. He suggested that the Commission recommend that the City and developer make an active effort to vitalize the station.

Kevin Poff suggested that the police station be relocated near the station if it is not included in the project.

Andrew Hiller agreed that the concern needs to be addressed. He suggested that the Planning Commission recommend that the developer work with UDOT regarding the issue.

Elizabeth Angyl suggested that a Resolution be drafted to address the location of the station, as well as the signalization on Park Lane.

John Bilton suggested that the thematic element include a “small town experience” as well as a station. He suggested that a meeting be held with UDOT regarding the location of the station.

Chairman Talbot said the Planning Commission will have the ability to consider the thematic elements during Site Plan review. The Planning Commission has made it clear to the developers that they prefer that the project have a “small town” feel.

Paul Barker asked how Station Park will compare in size to Jordan Landing and Center-Cal’s development in Oregon.

Fred Brooney stated that Bridgeport Village is 500,000 square feet. Jordan Landing is 1,400,000 square feet of retail space but it is a very different concept. Station Park will be strictly a lifestyle center.

Andrew Hiller asked how the developer plans to provide cable to the residential areas since Comcast Cable will not be in the area for 10-15 years.

A representative for CLC Engineering explained that Comcast will not be available in the area for approximately 10 years due to the existing roads, railroads, and pipelines.

Fred Brooney said there are different ways to address the issue, such as the possibility of providing one dish for the entire development.

Elizabeth Angyl referred to Condition #4 and suggested that the following language be added: *“PMP will be amended in a manner acceptable to the City and the developer.”* She also recommended that Condition #10 be amended using the draft language that she read earlier in the meeting.

Chairman Talbot said the Planning Commission would prefer that the term “small town” be included in the language.

Fred Brooney said they do not want the project to be limited by the term “small town.” They want the architecture to be exciting and vibrant.

Kevin Poff said the original intent was for the project to incorporate a Main Street type atmosphere.

Motion

Kevin Poff moved that the Planning Commission recommend that the City Council approve the proposed Project Master Plan (PMP) subject to the following:

1. Property included as part of the PMP must be rezoned to TOD.
2. The narrative and graphics must provide more information about pedestrian linkages including among other things: connections to the Legacy Highway trail, future accommodation for pedestrian connections to land north of the site, and more information regarding pedestrian circulation in general throughout the site.
3. The applicant should provide more detail in the narrative and graphics regarding how transit uses will connect with the Commuter Rail stop, how the site will accommodate an access system to and from Lagoon, and general information on how transit will be an integral part of the entire site.
4. The applicant must provide a more detailed traffic study approved by the City. Any conditions of approval related thereto shall also become conditions of the PMP. The PMP will be amended in a manner acceptable to the City and the Developer.
5. Concepts discussed in the narrative and information displayed on the graphics must be approved by the respective reviewing agency and/or utility, including but not limited to the City Engineer, Public Works Department, Fire Department, the City’s Storm Water Official, Sewer District, and the secondary water provider. The PMP must be updated to reflect comments received from the aforementioned entities.
6. Changes shall be made to the PMP as redlined by the City Planner.
7. The applicant must provide more information regarding truck traffic through the

site at the time of final site plan review for the site or portion of the site.

8. The applicant shall highlight the functional classification of streets on the plans, and show land requirements for transportation improvements and plans for intersection and control measures.
9. The applicant must submit legal maps and a legal description for the area.
10. Narrative must be provided describing that the building elevations will reflect an experience for the area "Main Street."
11. "Exhibits D-1 and D-2" shall not be part of the PMP.

[**Cory Ritz** arrived at 6:43 P.M.]

Paul Barker seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote. **Cory Ritz** abstained since he was not present during the discussion.

Findings

(a) Provides for a development of an area in proximity to Farmington's major transportation hub created by the convergence of Interstate 15, Highway 89, to the Legacy Highway, the proposed commuter rail stop and related facilities, that will encourage the creation of an architecturally unique, vibrant commercial and mixed use district reflective of Farmington's historic character;

(b) Provides for development of a Core District as identified in the General Plan within close proximity to Farmington's major transportation hub with compatible mixed uses in close proximity to one another to provide a blend of retail, service, office, dining and residential uses;

If the applicant meets the conditions of approval the PMP will further:

(c) Facilitate safe, attractive, and convenient pedestrian circulation and minimize conflicts between pedestrians and vehicles and encourage travel by transit, walking, bicycling, car pooling and van pooling;

(d) Provide open spaces, connections, and integrated landscaping, furnishings and lighting to encourage and promote the creation of a destination center as well as to encourage and promote an integrated traffic and pedestrian friendly development design;

- (e) Facilitate high-volume vehicle traffic in and out of the TOD Zone from major roadways while preserving the pedestrian-friendly character of the TOD Zone by establishing convenient and logical vehicular circulation paths with properly spaced and signalized intersections; limiting access off of major roadways while maintaining thoroughfare separation from the pedestrian zones; and controlling vehicular usage at pedestrian zones with traffic calming techniques including curvilinear roadways, surface material changes, roundabouts, and articulation.

JERRY PRESTON - APPLICANT IS REQUESTING PRELIMINARY PLAT APPROVAL FOR PHASE 1B OF THE RICE FARMS ESTATES PUD CONSISTING OF 4 LOTS ON 1.447 ACRES LOCATED AT APPROXIMATELY 50 WEST 700 SOUTH IN AN LR(PUD) ZONE, AND A RECOMMENDATION FOR FINAL PLAT APPROVAL RELATED THERETO (S-7-05) (Agenda Item #1)

Background Information

The applicant did not pursue approval for Phase 1B due to wetland issues preventing development. Now the U.S. Army Corp has provided their approval subject to certain conditions.

The improvement drawings for the development have already been approved by the City Engineer and the respective reviewing agencies.

END OF PACKET MATERIAL.

David Petersen displayed the Master Plan for Rice Valley Acres and pointed out where the five lots are located that could not be developed due to wetlands. The developer has since received a permit from the Army Corp of Engineers. City staff recommends that the Planning Commission approve the Preliminary Plat and recommend Final Plat approval.

Motion

Kevin Poff moved that the Planning Commission approve the preliminary plat and recommend that the City Council approve the final plat subject to the same conditions of preliminary and final plat approval for Phase 1A and subject to the requirements of the U.S. Army Corp of Engineers set forth in their letter to Jerry Preston dated November 1, 2006. **John Bilton** seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

Findings

- Phase 1B is consistent with the other phases of the development that were previously approved.

- The wetland issues have been resolved.

**PUBLIC HEARING: CALVIN BIRKENFELD - APPLICANT IS REQUESTING
CONDITIONAL USE APPROVAL TO CONSTRUCT A SECOND DRIVEWAY FOR
ACCESS TO A REAR YARD LOCATED AT 513 SOUTH 1025 WEST IN AN AE ZONE
(C-13-06) (Agenda Item #2)**

David Petersen displayed a Site Plan and explained the applicant's request. He read from Section 11-32-106 of the Ordinance which pertains to driveway access, as well as the section that pertains to "Exceptions." The driveway was not approved by the Planning Commission. He recommended that the Planning Commission grant conditional use approval for the applicant's second driveway.

Public Hearing

Chairman Talbot opened the meeting to a public hearing.

Public Hearing Closed

With no forthcoming comments, **Chairman Talbot** closed the public hearing.

John Bilton questioned whether the driveway meets the City's size restrictions.

David Petersen said the driveway was measured by **Ken Klinker** and was found to meet the City's standards.

Motion

Cory Ritz moved that the Planning Commission grant conditional use approval to construct a second driveway for access to a rear yard located at 513 South 1025 West in an AE zone. **Kevin Poff** seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

Findings

- The driveway meets the City's minimum size requirements.
- City staff has visited the site and recommends that approval be given.
- The conditional use meets the zoning requirements for the area.

**CHARLIE HUNSAKER - APPLICANT IS REQUESTING CONDITIONAL USE AND
SITE PLAN APPROVAL TO CONSTRUCT AND OPERATE A CONVENIENCE
STORE ON THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF PARK LANE AND LAGOON DRIVE IN
A CMU ZONE (C-11-06) (Agenda Item #4)**

Background Information

The Planning Commission conducted a public hearing for this request on November 8, 2006. They tabled action pending the results of a City Council decision regarding a proposed self storage facility located west of the site. Several weeks ago, the Commission denied a request from Dan Nixon for said self storage facility because it was not proposed as a "Planned Center" or a "Planned Unit Development." Section 11-019-04 of the Zoning Ordinance states in part, "specific uses allowed in a CMU zoned area... will be determined through the review and approval of either a Planned Unit Development pursuant to Chapter 27 of this Zoning Ordinance, or as a Planned Center."

The City Council considered an appeal by Mr. Nixon of the Planning Commission's decision on November 9, 2006. The Council decided that Mr. Nixon's request is an "anomaly" and can be reviewed as a Planned Center or Planned Unit Development (PUD). They remanded it back to the Planning Commission for further action. Moreover, the City Council and the City Attorney suggested that similar circumstances also apply to Charlie Hunsaker's convenience store proposal, and that it too should be considered as an anomaly.

The Planning Commission must determine if parking is adequate. Chapter 32 of the Zoning Ordinance calls for 4 parking spaces per 1000 square feet of floor area for "Intensive Commercial Businesses, Retail Stores and shops." This results in 23 spaces for the 5,868 square foot building (note: the total square footage should drop if the floor space which comprises the carwash is deducted from the total). However, a gas station may have different parking needs than a "shop." The first paragraph of Section 11-32-104 states:

Required off-street parking shall be provided for each land use as listed below. For any use not listed, the requirements for the most nearly similar use which is listed shall apply. The Planning Commission shall determine which listed use is most nearly similar. In special cases where it is determined that there is not a similar use, the Planning Commission, in consultation with the developer, shall establish the minimum parking space requirement:

It is the understanding of City staff that the Planning Commission is okay with the amount and placement of "Farmington Rock" on the structure. This should be verified at the Planning Commission meeting.

END OF PACKET MATERIAL.

David Petersen reviewed the "Background Information." He explained that the City Attorney recommended that the Hunsaker proposal be considered an anomaly. He reviewed the "Possible Motion" and the three conditions that were included in the motion. City staff recommends that the Planning Commission grant conditional use and site plan approval.

Dave Dixon displayed a rendering of the floor plan and elevation. He also displayed a site plan and pointed out where the parking stalls are located. The facility is 3,917 square feet so they have included 16 parking stalls. The gas station could have 30 cars on the site at one time and still function.

In response to a question from **Commissioner Bilton**, **David Petersen** explained that the City Attorney recommends that all of the lots within the Farmington Fields subdivision be considered an anomaly unless it is addressed in a zone text change.

The Planning Commission discussed whether the Farmington Fields subdivision will set a precedent since the City is allowing it to meet the standards of the previous zone text.

David Petersen explained that properties within the City are subject to the current zoning ordinances.

Motion

Kevin Poff moved that the Planning Commission grant conditional use and site plan approval for the request subject to all applicable Farmington City development standards and ordinances and the following:

1. Improvement drawings for the project, including grading and drainage plans, must be reviewed and approved by the City Engineer, Public Works Department, Fire Department, Planning Department, Benchland Water District, and Central Davis Sewer District. Any conditions of the aforementioned agencies shall also be conditions of the conditional use permit.
2. Applicant, along with City staff, must verify that an easement acceptable to the City is in place for the sidewalk on the east side property.
3. Lighting for the project must be subdued and shall be designed, located, and directed so as to eliminate glare and minimize reflection of light into neighboring properties. The specific lighting proposed for the project must be reviewed and approved by City staff.

John Bilton seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

Findings

1. The Ordinance does not provide a minimum area or parcel size for Planned Center Developments.

2. The property is under unified control.
3. The project is located on a primary commercial site along a major gateway to community.
4. The land uses provided in the project (i.e. convenience store, gasoline sales, car wash, office space, etc.) are internally complementary and are compatible with and complement surrounding land uses such as Lagoon and other uses contemplated for the area by the General Plan.
5. The land uses provided in the project are also internally complementary and are compatible with and complement surrounding land uses by utilizing effective site, structure, circulation and landscaping design in a coordinated manner.
6. The proposed use of the particular location is desirable to provide a service or facility which will contribute to the general well-being of the community.

ADJOURNMENT

Paul Barker moved that the Planning Commission adjourn at 7:02 P.M.

Jim Talbot, Chairman
Farmington City Planning Commission